DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 250 776 EA 017 246

AUTHOR Moore, Raymond S.
TITLE The Cradle and the Gap.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 21p.; In: Marshner, Connaught, Ed. A Blueprint for Education Reform. p231-250. For the complete document, see EA 017 236.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Cultural Education; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational Change; *Educational Improvement; Generation Gap; Government Role; *Home Schooling; Learning Readiness; Parent Role; Peer Influence; Research Reports; *School Entrance Age; Self Esteem; Socialization

ABSTRACT

From ancient times through the early centuries of this country's history, early puberty has been considered the proper time to go to school. Now, however, educators and psychologists have brainwashed the public into thinking that public schools can outparent families. The state has taken over education and removed children from the home at too young an age. This practice has led to: (1) a poorer education, as shown by the decline in literacy since the beginning of public education; (2) the creation of a generation gap, as a result of keeping children in institutions and away from parents; and (3) peer dependency and poor self-worth attitudes, because children spend more time with peers than with parents. Research and example have proved the theses that the home is the best educational nest, that parents are the best educators, and that parents are educable. Educational factors that make home schooling successful include the importance of the singular adult example undiluted by too many peers, the need to explore widely without the inhibitions of the classroom, the need for many quality personal adult-to-child responses, and the availability of books in public libraries. The best age for school entrance is in the range of 8-12 years old, as determined by early childhood studies on socialization and readiness for learning. Twenty-eight recommendations to offset many of the myths of modern education--supported by history, research, or common sense--are listed. (DCS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TEN

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Connaught Marshner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED250776

EA 017 246

The Cradle and the Gap

Raymond S. Moore

We have not heard very much lately about the hand that rocks the cradle. We seem to doubt that it still rules the world. Instead, an aggressive state and its passive citizens are combining to insure that the "world" rules the hand that rocks the cradle. This reversal of roles has also turned around the high levels of literacy and moral behavior which characterized early America. It will be hard to believe, but for over a hundred years—ever since we started public education—our nation has been declining in literacy, and in the process has gradually widened the gap between children and adults. It is no coincidence that in terms of her resources, America today has an abysmally low education product compared with other nations, and also has perhaps the least amount of family involvement in education. It is a record of history that when the state takes over the family, democracy dies. No wonder that President Reagan's Commission on Excellence declared that "If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war." Yet the public schools are no more to be blamed than the universities who train the teachers, the media which entertains, and derelict parents who do not know or care.

Even our poets have pointed us to lessons of history as a

basis for future plans. Ralph Waldo Emerson wisely observed that "The years teach much which the days never know." If there is any lesson that history teaches clearly it is that there is no faster way to break down a nation than to break up its homes. And this never happens more quickly than when the erosion begins within.

Researchers and scholars like Harvard's Carle Zimmerman,[1] and J. D. Unwin[2] look beyond mere generation gaps to the possibility that we may lose our sense of family altogether. Already since World War II the "gap" has been powerfully and sadly felt by those who became the lost generation of the 60's and 70's.

The youngsters of those generations are now mature with homes of their own. Yet I observe a difference from generations past. These new families have less interest in caring for their older folks. They prefer the availability of Medicare, retirement centers and "rest" homes. The historic ethic of strong familism—each family caring for its own from birth to death—has surrendered to the narcissistic philosophy of letting somebody else do the caring. That "somebody else" may be the state or the county or Social Security or if fortunate, a pension.

The pitiful and bitter personal gap is still growing.

How does this happen? I contend that it starts with the surrender of a child from his earliest years to the institutions of the state or to alternative institutions. You who linger long with your children will find that they will linger long with you. On the other hand, the earlier you institutionalize your children, the earlier they will institutionalize you.

Yet, our society has become convinced that nursery school is a status symbol, and family life has surrendered to convention dictated by narcissistic philosophies and psychologists who either know or care little about children or who are on a devious mission to destroy our nation. And this is neither paranoia nor alarmism. Our educators and our psychologists have in fact brainwashed us into the assurance that they can outparent us.

Cornell's Urie Bronfenbrenner found that at least until

the fifth or sixth grade, the child who is more with his peers than his parents will probably become peer-dependent.[3] Until at least age 11 or 12 he is highly vulnerable to the "social contagion"—habits, manners, finger signs, obscenities, rivalry, ridicule, and so on—rampant today. Even if his parents are still shockable, he does not fully understand the furrowed brow nor care about the remonstrances placed before him in love. All he knows is that when everybody is doing it, he is to do it, because his peers say so. He gives parental values the back of his young, inexperienced hand. This social cancer of peer dependency usually lasts for a lifetime. And to the extent that he becomes peer dependent, the child develops in time a miserable view of himself, his future, his parents, and even of his peers. All because he has been pushed out of the home nest and institutionalized too soon! This child, once very normal, now finds that he has little self-esteem or self-direction and, in a creative sense, offers little promise as a productive and patriotic citizen. Eventually he will grow up to have even less use for his parents than they had for their parents.

Many ask if we can reverse this trend. I believe that there is still some hope.

From ancient times through the early centuries of our country's history, the period of early puberty was considered the proper time to go to school. Age 12 or 13 was understood to be the time when a child's values were fairly stabilized and he could assume responsibility for his acts. The Jews called this bar mitzvah. The research of famed Swiss psychologist Jean Piaget centuries later agreed. "Cognitive" readiness, he called it—the age at which children in general are able to reason consistently from cause to effect.[4]

Many psychologists and psychiatrists, such as the late great J. T. Fisher, have proved that a child going to school at 12 or 13, now called adolescence, can quickly catch up and pass children who with anxiety and frustration have gone to school too early.[5] Dr. Fisher started school at 13 and graduated from high school at 16. He thought that he was pretty smart until experience taught him that any "normal child" can do it.

More than a half million parents, disturbed at school trends, have decided to educate their own children at home, utilizing simple, readily-available curricula. Some are physicians, attorneys, even school administrators. One is a presiding superior court jurist in a major American city. There are many who do not have a college education. Nevertheless nearly all their children excel in achievement, behavior and social ability. The child who feels needed, wanted and depended upon at home, who senses that he is part of the family "corporation" is the one who has self-worth. And self-worth is the key to a positive sociability.

Frank Vandiver, formerly head of Rice University and at this writing, President of Texas A & M, quit school at grade seven, skipped junior high, senior high and college to enter the University of Texas by examination at the master's level. There are others who are following in his footsteps nowadays. Grant Colfax was left free to raise pedigreed family goats until he was fifteen, when his mother began to formalize his education at home. Although neither mother nor father had scientific leanings, Grant recently enrolled in Harvard's biology program on a full scholarship via examination. Nor is this unusual. University of California, Berkeley, accepts a few home schoolers each year. Incidentally, history still repeats itself. For the last thirteen of his eighteen years, the Colfax home, like that of home-schooled John Quincy Adams or Abe Lincoln or Tom Edison, was without electricity, far away in the "boonies" of Boonville, California. Grant's younger brother, Drew, is following in his footsteps except that he was not so much influenced by the family goats as by the stars overhead. So at age fifteen he produced his first 12" refracting telescope and is well on his way to becoming an astrophysicist.

But protests come from hard-shelled psychologists and educators that the boys obviously issued from genius stock. And that may be right. It is also right that home schools across the country, in general, significantly outrank the institutions as measured by national norms regardless of the level of education of the parents. But in the case of the Colfax's the answer is even more specific. David and

Mickey Colfax just happen to have adopted two younger sons, neither of them genetically related to the Colfax line. They are Reed, 13, who is Black, and Garth, 9, who is an Eskimo. These youngsters are showing the same qualities of genius as demonstrated by the Colfax's blood sons.

The reasons for this are really not that complex. Our principal educational channels are, of course, books. But more important for a young child's creative, productive learning, are the singular adult example, undiluted by too many peers, the freedom to explore widely, uninhibited by the cloisters of a typical classroom and the number of adult-to-child responses per day.

Some educators might argue that schools excel in item one, except that they forget that, as with the Colfax's, the public library—a gift of home-schooled Andrew Carnegie—is available for all children. In any event books are not as crucial to basic education as are the other three.

The importance of the undiluted *adult example* is vastly underestimated these days as we educators have set out to scratch the ability of parents to parent their own. The Bronfenbrenner studies at Cornell make this point clearly. Albert Bandura's work at Stanford, to mention only one of many studies, clearly shows that peer dependency is pervasive at the preschool level.[6] No wonder that in ancient times and through the first two centuries of American life most children did not start regular school until around 12 or 13. Even at those ages they went to school only three months out of the year until the Civil War and worked even then at least a half a day at home—in a neat physical balance for their mental efforts. Interestingly enough, that kind of education brought American estimated literacy rates of around 98 or 99% from colonial days to the Civil War.[7]

Free exploration is commonly known by developmental psychologists to be among the most effective of all educators. The birds and the bugs, the trees with their leaves, the stars and the fish and beasts all make sense and provide a great deal of information to the young child. He learns colors and textures, and sights and smells and tastes, and places them all in proper context uninhibited by the

categorical influences of the classroom and its confining limits to learning. Cartoonist Tom Armstrong's character, "Marvin," described early-care institutions as "penitentiaries." But this is not funny for most children, particularly the very bright whose creative minds try to stretch beyond the school walls but who are forced in their anguish to let creativity die.

The fourth factor, *numbers of responses*, along with the quality of those responses, may be the most powerful educational factor of all. The average child in the average schoolroom today will receive from one to four or five personal responses from his teacher during the school day depending on how aggressive he is. Dean John Goodlad of the University of California at Los Angeles reported in 1983 on his study of 1,016 classrooms across the nation that the average teacher provided person-to-person responses to his students for an aggregate of seven minutes per day.[8] In contrast, a reasonably warm, responsive home or family school will supply 50 to 100 times as many responses as the average classroom. The quality of those responses often demonstrates a partiality which the child needs, and which parents are allowed, but from which classroom teachers are prohibited.

Public education as we know it today was a post-Civil War fact in which avant-garde educators of those days—such as Horace Mann and Samuel Coombs—set out to build an educational hierarchy which placed emphasis on personality, with a deemphasis on character development. Eventually the modern "I'm okay, you're okay" values of the narcissist became the way of our day with their full complement of amusements, sports and almost anything but productive work and self control. At the same time all of this positive thinking without experience in positive and creative doing has brought us down to a shocking literacy level. The University of Texas adult studies published in 1983 tell us that 20% of Americans have no survival literacy ability at all.[9] They cannot sign a check, make out an application for a driver's license or a job or do even the most minimal of necessities in terms of reading and writing

and figuring. Another 30% have doubtful survival skills and only 50% of Americans today have these skills for sure.

On December 29, 1940 Walter Lippmann, the well-known pundit, delivered an address under the auspices of Phi Beta Kappa before the American Association for the Advancement of Science in the Irving Auditorium at the University of Pennsylvania.[10] Those credentials are about as sterling as you can find. What did he say? He looked back to the turn of the century:

> I venture to submit to you . . .
>
> that during the past 40 to 50 years those who are responsible for education have progressively removed from the curriculum of studies the Western culture which produced the modern democratic state;
>
> that the schools and colleges have, therefore, been sending out into the world men who no longer understand the creative principle of the society in which they must live;
>
> that, deprived of their cultural tradition, the newly educated Western men no longer possess in the form and substance of their own minds and spirits, the ideas, the premises, the rationale, the logic, the method, the values, or the deposited wisdom which are the genius of the development of Western civilization;
>
> that the prevailing education is destined, if it continues, to destroy Western civilization and is in fact destroying it;
>
> that our civilization cannot effectively be maintained where it still flourishes or be restored where it has been crushed without the revival of central, continuous, and perennial culture of the Western world;
>
> and that, therefore, what is now required in the modern educational system is not the expansion of its facilities or the specific reform of its curriculum and administration but a thorough reconsideration of its underlying assumptions and of its purposes.

Lippmann went on to concede that he was making "a sweeping indictment of modern education." But he defended his indictment firmly. He pointed out that the modern public school was not giving us what Thomas Jefferson had hoped. "As a matter of fact," Lippmann declared,

During the 20th Century the generations trained in these schools have either abandoned their liberties or they have not known, until the last desperate moment, how to defend them. The schools were to make men free. They have been in operation for some 60 or 70 years (as of 1940) and what was expected of them they have not done. The plain fact is that the graduates of modern schools are the actors of the catastrophe which has befallen our civilization. Those who are responsible for modern education—for its controlling philosophy—are answerable for the results.

They have determined the formation of the mind and education of modern men. As the tragic events unfold they cannot evade their responsibility by talking about the crimes and follies of politicians, businessmen, labor leaders, lawyers, editors and generals. They have conducted the schools and colleges and they have educated the politicians, businessmen, labor leaders, lawyers, editors and generals. What is more they have educated the educators.

Lippmann moved on to describe how *these schools have effectively destroyed the image of historic America and its democratic ideals "by separating education from the classical religious tradition. The school cannot train the pupil to look upon himself as an inviolable person because he is made in the image of God."* Lippmann concluded that "education founded on the secular image of man must destroy knowledge itself."

In order to emasculate American education, American educators have built up an aura of sacredness around the public schools until we have become more reverent of them than we have of motherhood itself and far more than we have of our God. But this has not satisfied these elite minds. In order to carry on their destruction they have had to fly in the face of principles they themselves have claimed to establish, for instance the inviolability of replicable research. Reliable research does indeed tell truth, but these people cannot bear with truth. So they ignore research. For example, *there is no replicable research whatsoever that suggests that normal children should be rushed earlier into school.* Even some of the great "progressive educators" like John Dewey and Angelo Rossi admonished American

educators before the turn of the century by warning that little children should not be entered into school before 8.[11] Modern research not only verifies this, but also suggests that the really old-fashioned education from the ancient Jews is much more defensible. The Jews began schooling at about 13.

And of course we have the "great society" idea of school consolidation. This notion was the gift of the noted Harvard president, James Bryant Conant. But before he died, he came to realize that he was shooting from the hip. The great educational centers that he conceived for mass education had even before his death become educational ghettoes with vast educational smorgasbords in which neither teachers nor students could agree on what is best to take. Such top-of-the-head, seat-of-the-pants innovation has pushed research aside. Innovation—something novel—has become the theme of American education; change for change's sake has replaced true creativity in the schools.

Whether a person looks to the developmental research of vision, hearing and the other senses of the child, or the many studies on the brain, or Jean Piaget's often replicated research on cognition, you must come to the conclusion that the best nest for little children is the home until at least 8 to 10 or 12. University of Chicago's well-known perception psychologist, Joseph Wepman concluded years ago that if we could wait until at least 8 to 10 to place our children in formal education we could reduce the reading failure rate in our country to 2%.[12] And his University of Chicago colleague, Benjamin Bloom, who fought Wepman's ideas for years and who fathered much of the early schooling movement, finally was forced to similar conclusions as Wepman's when in 1980 he published his thesis that the home was the best educational nest afterall, parents the best educators and that parents were in fact educable.[13]

Yet all of these well established facts and revised conclusions are given little thought by such vested interests as the National Education Association and the American Federation of Teachers who repeatedly have expressed far greater concern for teachers' jobs than they have for the welfare of

the young child. Gerald Koch, a vocal teachers' spokesman, while Chairman of the Unicameral Legislature's Education Committee for the State of Nebraska, stated in private conversation with the author that the reason behind having children begin school at age 3 or 4 was so that teaching jobs would be created by the change.

There are a few brave souls around who are willing to face up to social pressure and conventional wisdom and practice. Dr. John Bowlby, the London psychiatrist who heads the World Health Organization program on Early Childhood Development, insists that a relatively ineffective home is still often better for the child than a reasonably good school.[14] Dr. Martin Engel, then the Director of the nation's National Day Care Demonstration Project in Washington, D.C., pointed out:

> The motive to rid ourselves of our children, even if it is partial, is transmitted more vividly to the child than all our rationalizations about how good it is for that child to have good interpersonal peer group activities, a good learning experience, a good foundation for school, life, etc., etc. And even the best, most humane and personalized day-care environment cannot compensate for the feeling of rejection which the young child unconsciously senses.[15]

The facts are that we are creating learning disability in our country and in pushing our little children into school too early we are not only making them frustrated and anxiety ridden with respect to their studies, but we are also making them delinquent, for the Department of Health Education and Welfare statistics on learning disability and delinquency go implicitly together. And this isn't all.

For more than 40 years some of us have been concerned that most children are surrendered by homes to institutional life before they are ready—with serious implications for the children, the family, society, nation and world, including economical and moral disaster. In the late 1960s following a stint at the U.S. Office of Education, I became convinced that our children were victims of dangerous trends toward earlier schooling. We had reasons to be

skeptical of school claims for early academic achievement and socialization simply because "young children learn so fast." By giving our schools "green grain" for their mills, we make their task impossible. Although challenging conventional wisdom and practice was not a pleasant prospect, colleagues around the world have more and more given support to our research, some reversing historic positions to do so.

Our conclusions are actually quite old-fashioned. They seem new to some because they differ largely from, and often challenge, conventional practice. Our early childhood research grew out of experiences in the classroom with children who were misbehaving or not learning because they were not ready for formal schooling. Concerned first with academic achievement, we set out to determine the best ages for school entrance. But more important has been the socialization of young children—which also involves senses, coordination, brain development, reason, and social-emotional aspects of child development. These conclusions come from our Stanford, University of Colorado Medical School, Michigan State and Hewitt investigative teams who did basic research, and also analyzed more than 8,000 early childhood studies. We offer briefly here our conclusions which you can check against any sound research that you know.[16]

Readiness For Learning. Despite early excitement for school, many, if not most, early entrants (ages 4, 5, 6, etc.) are tired of school before they are out of the third or fourth grades—at about the ages and levels we found that they should be starting. Tufts University Psychologist David Elkind calls these pressured youngsters "intellectually burned out."[17] They are far better off wherever possible waiting until ages 8 to 10 to start formal studies (at home or school)—in the second, third, fourth or fifth grade. They then quickly pass early entrants in learning, behavior and sociability. Their vision, hearing and other senses are not ready for continuing formal programs of learning until at least age 8 or 9. When earlier care is absolutely necessary, it

should be informal, warm and responsive like a good home, with a low adult-to-child ratio.

The eyes of most children are permanently damaged before age 12. Neither the maturity of their delicate central nervous systems nor the "balancing" of the hemispheres of their brains, nor yet the insulation of their nerve pathways provide a basis for thoughtful learning before 8 or 9. The integration of these maturity levels (IML) comes for most between 8 and 10. It is not fair to test children for formal learning before at least age 10.[18]

This coincides with the well-established findings of Jean Piaget and others that children cannot handle cause-and-effect reasoning in any consistent way before late 7's to middle 11's. And the bright child is no exception. So the 5's and 6's are subjected to dull rote learning which requires little thought, tires, frustrates and ruins motivation, stimulates few "hows" and "whys." Net results: frequent learning failure, delinquency. For example, little boys trail little girls about a year in maturity, yet are under the same school entrance laws. Research is clear that boys are 3 or 4 to 1 more often learning disabled, 3 or 4 to 1 delinquent, and 9 to 1 acutely hyperactive.[19] So, unknowing teachers far more often tag little boys as "naughty" or "dumb." And the labels frequently follow them through school.

Socialization. We later became convinced that little children are not only better taught at home than at school, but also better socialized by parental example and sharing than by other little children. This idea was fed by many researchers from Tufts, Cornell, Stanford and California, including Urie Bronfenbrenner and Albert Bandura.[20] Contrary to common beliefs, little children are not best socialized by other kids; the more persons around them, the fewer meaningful contacts. We found that socialization is not neutral. It tends to be either positive or negative.

(1) Positive or altruistic and principled sociability is firmly linked with the family—with the quantity and quality of self-worth. This is in turn dependent largely on the track of values and experience provided by the family at least until the child can reason consistently. In other words, the

child who works and eats and plays and has his rest and is read to daily, more with his parents than with his peers, senses that he is part of the family corporation—needed, wanted, depended upon. He is the one who has a sense of self-worth. And when he does enter school, preferably not before 8 to 10, he usually becomes a social leader. He knows where he is going, is independent in values and skills. He largely avoids the dismal pitfalls and social cancer of peer dependency. He is the productive, self-directed, citizen our nation badly needs.

Negative, me-first sociability is born from more peer group association and fewer meaningful parental contacts and responsibility experiences in the home during the first 8 to 12 years. The early peer influence generally brings an indifference to family values which defy parents' correction. The child does not yet consistently understand the "why" of parental demands when his peers replace his parents as his models because he is with them more. Research shows that such peer dependency brings loss of self-worth, optimism, respect for parents and trust in peers. What does the child have left to lose? So he does what comes naturally: He adapts to the ways of his agemates because "everybody's doing it." And . . . he has few sound values to pass on to the next generation.

So home, wherever possible, is by far the best nest until at least 8 to 10. In a reasonably warm home, adult-child responses, which are the master key to education, will be 50 to 100 times more than the average teacher-child responses in the classroom. Where there is any reasonable doubt about the influence of schools on our children (morality, ridicule, rivalry, denial of religious values, etc.) home schools are usually a highly desirable alternative. Some 35 states permit them by law under various conditions. Other states permit them through court decisions. Home schools nearly always excel regular schools in achievement. Although most of them don't know it, parents are the best teachers for most children at least through ages 10 or 12.

In 1983 I was asked to recommend therapies for American Education to the Texas Governor's Select Committee

on Education, chaired by Mr. Ross Perot and the Washington Governor's Citizens Commission on Education, chaired by Mr. Fred Haley. Here are a few suggestions to offset many of the myths of modern education and to give our children and our nation a chance to become the world's leading productive free enterprise system again.

—*History* has much to teach 20th Century Americans about education. Patrick Henry is but one voice which testifies to its importance when he said, "I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience."

—*Research* is replete with directions for our families and schools. We speak of *replicable* research which offers truth rather than the vested presumptions of studies that are not replicable. And we must bring that research actively into the planning, legislation and execution of education. This we are not doing as Americans and leaders, examples, to the western world. Evidence of this is that many, if not all, of the recommendations below (see starred items in particular) are supported by research, yet are either ignored or denied generally in our schools.

—*Common Sense.* If the record of history and/or of research and experimentation clearly shows that an idea is plausible or has worked, and there is no systematic, replicable evidence to the contrary, common sense says, "Try it," and courage sees that we try it regardless of human traditions, social pressures and jurisdictions. The following recommendations are made to local, state and national bodies with the assumption that common sense still can reign.

1. Inquire of the kind of education which prevailed when our nation was at a higher level of literacy and creativity, when American youth turned from crime.

2. Insist upon sound research evidence which crosses the various disciplines before making any and all policy decisions (as, for example, in early schooling laws where

research in vision, hearing and other senses, in cognition, in neurophysiology, in motor coordination and in socialization and behavior clearly contradict recent legislative trends).

*3. Provide a greater flexibility in school entrance laws in order to

a. Express awareness of wide disparity (at least four to five years) in readiness for formal schooling.
b. Insure boys the same readiness opportunities as girls.
c. Guarantee parents their constitutional rights (as interpreted by the U.S. Supreme Court over the past 60 years) to determine the education of their children.
d. Affirm and define the state's limited compelling interests to insure minimal skills, health and safety and education for citizenship, including both school and social welfare officials.

*4. Place larger emphasis on education of parents and less on institutionalizing children, including an aura of approval, on those parents who choose to work at home.

5. Welcome as satellites to school systems (public and parochial) those concerned parents who prefer to systematically teach their children at home.

6. Be less defensive about home schools in view of their high record in studies comparing them with national norms, i.e., other schools.

7. Apply truancy laws only to parents who are in fact truant or negligent in the care of their children.

*8. Reevaluate certification/accreditation policies for general education (K-12), on the basis of fact, in view of the lack of replicated research which supports such practices.

*9. Study to desegregate by age

a. By developing small schools.
b. By developing ungraded programs.
c. By encouraging home education.
d. By encouraging any method that brings children in larger contact and companionship with youn-

ger and older persons in order that they may be comfortable with all ages, more responsible in their behavior and less vulnerable to peer dependency.

*10. Move away from consolidation, busing, etc. toward smaller, more manageable, more personal neighborhood or rural schools—as much as possible like a warm, responsive family.

*11. Remove policy approval of, and educate away from, demands for rote homework; and encourage supervised study in the classroom—and more creative homework, if any at all.

*12. Balance academic studies with *at least equivalents of practical arts and manual skills*—which bring significantly higher academic performance than all-day academic classes. Insure that teachers share manual work.

*13. Simplify curricula, viewing education more as an active, exploratory, inspirational, responsive, experimental process and less as a formal didactic one, yet maintaining sound controls through high motivation. (This is essentially the recipe for development of genius.)

*14. View discipline as the fine art of discipleship making it clear that sound followership precedes sound leadership.

*15. Utilize cross-age teaching far more prominently, realizing that students are often more facile teachers than the classroom heads.

*16. Minimize focus of child eyes on television, computers and other close-in vision, for this insures myopia and myopia is a leading cause of blindness.

17. Insist on maximizing free exploration for all children.

*18. Place major emphases on teacher responsiveness to individual pupils, a preeminent source of genius. This kind of responsiveness is done so well in the home, whereas the average teacher today spends about seven minutes daily in such responses.

*19. Put away the myth that a positive sociability derives more from association with little children (and their peer

pressures) than from a warm responsive home—with its building of self worth and self direction.

20. Orient children more to altruistic service and less to narcissistic amusements and sports.

21. Place specifically greater emphasis on character education of an altruistic, moral and patriotic sort.

22. Teach altruistic manners, etiquette, poise in walking, speech (expression, elocution) listening, etc. and respect for elders—that they may not only make a better world but one day reap respect themselves.

23. Teach writing by writing, with every teacher in his classroom a monitor of the mother tongue, regardless of subject taught—freely utilizing journals, diaries, letters, essays, stories in daily practice.

*24. Reevaluate classroom methods, e.g.,

a. Teaching more to think (ask *why*, how) than to be reflectors of others thoughts (what's, where's, when's).
b. Grant more time for child to answer thoughtfully.
c. Provide daily success experiences—even if they have to be "arranged."

*25. Reexamine college and university teacher education courses to insure that

a. Prospective teachers are screened early in their college years, before they get well into their professional sequence (by giving them trial classroom experience as student assistants).
b. Student teachers demonstrate creativity and leadership.
c. There is a genuine love for and understanding of children and the teaching process, so that, if possible, the motivation to teach transcends the demand for remuneration.
d. Teachers rebuild the *professional* ethic (vis-a-vis the union ethics), viewing teaching as the highest possible calling.
e. Great teaching is honored and where possible, financially rewarded.

*26. Develop interinstitutional cooperation at all levels

and among all institutions: schools, colleges, libraries, museums, public services (forestry, commerce, etc.), homes, etc.

*27. Continue to provide for the acutely disadvantaged and the handicapped but take care

a. To insure wherever possible that the home is the basic nest.
b. That the unique structured programs for the handicapped are not generalized for all individuals.

*28. For young children, avoid pressure to teach reading skills before the senses, motor coordination, and cognition are reasonably mature and integrated, which is not before the age of 8 to 10 years.

a. In the meantime provide opportunities for free exploration, creative activities, life experiences and experimentation with objects rather than toys as the primary learning medium.
b. Provide small adult to child ratio in order to greatly increase the amount of personal responses and interaction, to provide adult models for children to imitate in social skills, language, manners, etc. and to allow more child rather than adult-initiated and terminated activities. In other words as much as possible imitate the model of the warm, responsive home to plan the school and the loving, consistent parent as the ideal for the teacher.

If we are to believe sociologists J. D. Unwin or Carle Zimmerman, we must spend more time with our children in the home, lest our society, like Greece and Rome, be lost. The conditions are now identical to theirs. Let's have more loving firmness, less indulgence; more work with you, fewer toys; more service for others—the old, poor, infirm—and less sports and amusements; more self-control, patriotism, productiveness and responsibility—which lead to, and follow, self-worth as children of God. Parents and home, undiluted, usually do this best. And they, not the

schools, are the only ones who can close the gap and place the ruling hand once again where it belongs.

References

1. C. Zimmerman and M. Frampton, *Family and Society*, (New York: Van Nostrand, 1947).
2. J. D. Unwin, *Sex and Culture*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1932).
3. Urie Bronfenbrenner, *Two Worlds of Childhood*, (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1970), p. 109.
4. Jean Piaget, "The Stages of the Intellectual Development of the Child." *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 26 (1962), p. 120-145.
5. J. T. Fisher and L. S. Hawley, *A Few Buttons Missing*. (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1951).
6. A. Bandura and A. Huston, "Identification as a Process of Incidental Learning." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 63:311-18, 1961. A. Bandura, D. Ross, and S. A. Ross, "Transmission of Aggression Through Imitation of Aggressive Models." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 52:575-82, 1961. A. Bandura and R. H. Walters, *Social Learning and Personality Development* (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1963).
7. Dean Hubbard, "Literacy and the American Revolution." Unpublished doctoral paper, Stanford, California, 1975.
8. John Goodlad, "A Study of Schooling: Some Findings and Hypotheses," Phi Delta Kappan, 64:7, March, 1983.
9. *Adult Performance Level Project*, (Austin, Texas: University of Texas, 1983).
10. Walter Lippmann, "Education vs. Western Civilization." An address delivered under the auspices of Phi Beta Kappa at the annual meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Irvine Auditorium, University of Pennsylvania, December 29, 1940. *The American Scholar*, Spring, 1941.
11. John Dewey, "The Primary Education Fetich." Forum 25(1898), 314-328.
12. Joseph Wepman in a 1967 speech in Seattle to the International Reading Association (444 N. Capitol Street, Washington, DC 20001). Also quoted by Malcolm Douglass, 1968. Innovation and the credibility gap. Paper presented to the California Elementary School Administrators Association and the California Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, January 1968, Palo Alto, California.
13. Benjamin Bloom, *All Our Children Learning*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980).
14. John Bowlby, *Maternal Care and Mental Health*, (New York: Schocken Books, 1967), pp. 68-69.
15. Martin Engel, "Rapunzel Rapunzel, let down your golden hair: Some

thoughts on early childhood education." Unpublished manuscript, National Demonstration Center in Early Childhood Education, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C.
16. See the author's *School Can Wait* Chapter 3, (Hewitt Research Foundation, P.O. Box 9, Washougal, WA 98671).
17. David Elkind, "Piagetian and Psychometric Conception of Intelligence." Harvard Educational Review 39:2(1969), pp. 319-337.
18. R. S. Moore and Dorothy N. Moore, *Better Late Than Early*, (New York: Reader's Digest Press, 1975). (Now published by Hewitt-Moore Publishing, Waco, TX). R. S. Moore and Dorothy N. Moore, *School Can Wait*, (Hewitt Research Foundation, P.O. Box 9, Washougal, WA, 1979).
19. E. E. Maccoby, "Sex differences in intellectual functioning," in *The Development of Sex Differences*, ed. E. E. Maccoby, (Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press), pp. 25-55. J. M. Tanner, *Education and Physical Growth* (New York: International Universities Press). N. Bailey, "Development of mental abilities," in *Carmichael's Manual of Child Psychology*, ed. J. Mussen, 1:1163-1209, (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1970). I. B. King, "Effect of age of entrance into grade I upon achievement in elementary school," *Elementary School Journal* 55:331-36 (1955). F. Bentzen, "Sex ratios in learning and behavior," *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 33:92-98 (1963). D. L. Mumpower, "Sex ratios found in various types of referred exceptional children," *Exceptional Children* 36:621-22 (1970). N. Cutts and N. Mosley, *Teaching the Disorderly Pupil in Elementary and Secondary School*, (New York: Longmans, 1957).
20. See R. S. and D. N. Moore, *School Can Wait*, Chapter 3; and Bronfenbrenner, *Two Worlds of Childhood*, p. 101.